

a chief part of our prayer unto Christ, as the woman of Tokoah unto David, *Save, O King.*

*The Hebrews.*—It is calculated that there exist between 4,000,000 and 5,000,000 of Hebrews, dispersed through the four quarters of the world, descended in a direct line from, and maintaining the same customs and religion with their forefathers, who, 3000 years ago, retreated from Egypt under the guidance of their inspired Lawgiver. Of the number of these people in Africa, little can be ascertained. 150 families alone inhabit the great city of Alexandria, in Egypt. In Cairo, they amount to 2000. In Malabar, 1000. In Bakhara reside 2000 families; in Balkh 150. In Persia 3590. (They are treated more harshly in Persia, than in any other part of the globe—every where Princes, says Mr. Woolf, in comparison with those in the land of Persia.) In Mesopotamia and Assyria, their ancient seats—they number 5,270 families. At Damascus there are 7 Synagogues. In Yemon reside 18,000. In Safet and Jerusalem 10,000. In the Turkish dominions, not including Barbary, they are numbered at 800,000: At Constantinople 10,000. At Adrianople 800 families—13 Synagogues. In Salonichi 30,000. In the Crimea 1,200. In the Austrian dominions 650,000: In the Prussian 135,000. In the rest of Germany 138,000. In Copenhagen 1491. Netherlands 90,000. France 50,000. Gibraltar 3 or 4000. In Italy 7000. In Great Britain from 12 to 15,000. In America 6000. In Charleston they may be estimated at from 900 to 1000.

ORIGINAL.

PAPAL SUPREMACY.

*He, who is not with me, is against me: and he, who gathers not with me, scatters.*—Mat. 12, 30.

It were passing strange indeed; and more, than a natural way could be accounted for; that, notwithstanding human ambition, which has manifested itself all along, in Church as well as state; nay which even appeared among the Apostles, striving for superiority under the eye of Christ himself; when he checked them, saying: *He who is the greater among you let him become as the younger; & he who is the leader, as he, who serveth.* Luke 22, 26, (there was therefore to be among them a greater, and a leader, whom he trains to humility by his own example: for which, says he, is greater; he who sitteth at table; or he who serveth? Is it not he who sitteth at table? But I am in the midst of you, as he who serveth, *ibid.*, v. 27. Wherefore does the Pope subscribe himself in all his solemn mandates and oecumenical addresses, *SERVUS SERVORUM DEI*, or *servant of the servants of God.*) It were truly wonderful and unaccountable on any principle, but that of divine right; that from the earliest ages of christianity down to the present times, the Bishop of Rome; as the successor of St. Peter, should have been universally acknowledged, without a dissentient voice but one in the whole Episcopal order, (that of the ambitious Photias, Arch Bishop of

Constantinople, who began the Greek Schism in the ninth century) that he should be thus regarded and proclaimed by all as the Chief of the sacred Hierarchy; the declaratory organ of their common sentiments; and the visible head of the Catholic Church.

We shall first show the scriptural grounds, on which he has been considered as such; and secondly the universal consent of the ancient Fathers in regarding him as the supreme Bishop: the visible centre and key-stone of Catholicity.

The chief scriptural ground, on which the Pope, as successor to St. Peter builds his title to supremacy; is the Saviour's solemn declaration addressed to him in particular: *Thou art Peter, (or the rock) and upon this rock will I build my church: and the gates of Hell shall not prevail against it. And to thee will I give the Keys of the kingdom of Heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth, shall be bound also in Heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth, shall be loosed also in heaven.* Mat. 16, 18.

In our last number, when refuting the Sentinel's ignorant quibble about *petros* and *petra*, employed both, for the reasons we assigned, to express in the Greek the single word *Cephas* repeated in the Hebrew, or Syriac original; we made it pretty clear that Peter was the very identical *rock*, or mystical foundation, on which Christ said he would build his Church. In corroboration of this, we shall here add a few more observations.

First we must avow that God never gave a name nor desired a name to be given, to any of his distinguished servants; without granting also the realization of its prophetic import. This is amply proved on scriptural evidence: as in the case of Abraham, Sarai, Isaac, Jacob, Joseph, Gedeon, Samuel, &c., whose names were all indicative of some distinctive favor, dignity, perquisite or power supernaturally conferred upon these, and other individuals mentioned in the holy scriptures. And can we suppose that the name of *Cephas*, was given by the Saviour to Simon, the son of Jonas, without any intended meaning, or significative distinction whatever from the rest of the Apostles? The name given to Simon was *Cephas*, a rock, or a stone: and on that same *Cephas* repeated, (that rock or stone,) Christ said he would build his Church: and by that same title of *Cephas* ever after was Simon, the son of Jonas distinguished from the rest of his brethren. Was there nothing more intended in all this by the Saviour, than the mere change of a name. Then why change his name at all, since he was as well known and distinguished from others by the name of Simon, as by that of *Cephas*?

If those blind protesters, who affect such intimate acquaintance with the written word, were but half as well instructed in its contents and meaning as Catholics generally are; they would perceive what is very obvious, that Christ here but confirms to his Apostle, in reward of his explicit faith, that name, by which he had told him before that he should be called. *And Jesus, looking on him, said: thou art Simon, the son of Jonas: thou shalt be called Cephas; which is interpreted Peter.* John, 1, 42.

They would hereby perceive that, as Abraham, for his faith, was named by the deity *the father of many*; Genes. 17, 6. So Peter, for his faith, received from Christ a name, which distinguished him as the visible head, and spiritual father of a new generation: of those who should worship God *in spirit and in truth*: John, 4, 23, as the chief of those stones indirectly alluded to by the Saviour; of which he said, *God was able, in the fulfilment of the promise, to raise up children to Abraham*; Mat. 3, 9, as the first visible stone of the spiritual building; resting on the invisible one of its foundation; and on which must rest all the other stones to be superadded in the superstructure. And to shew that the name given to Simon was not a mere empty title; but that it implied the grant to him of real and supreme dignity and power; the Saviour makes to him, over and above, the following magnificent and solemn declaration: *and to thee will I give the keys of the kingdom of Heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth, shall be bound also in Heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth, shall be loosed also in Heaven.* If this be not the grant of supremacy in the amplest sense; we should like to know what is still wanting here to constitute it such. Is he not hereby constituted master of the sacred household or Governor of the Holy City, to whom the keys of either are so unreservedly consigned? Does not this show that Peter was chosen to be the special representative of Jesus Christ; his vicar here on earth; the *visible rock*, on which his Church is built; and the supreme ruler of his spiritual kingdom?

But why then, some may ask; did not Christ say plainly; *and upon thee, will I build my Church.* Because such a speech would have destroyed all the justness and beauty of the Metaphor employed: for to build a house upon a man, presents an absurd idea to the imagination.

But protestants will maintain that the Saviour's declaration was as much directed to the other Apostles, as to Peter. If so, why then did not Christ say instead of *blessed art thou Simon, son of Jonas, &c. Blessed are ye &c.* why did he not say to all present: *To you will I give &c.* instead of *to thee will I give &c.* And hence it is justly inferred, that though Peter spoke the sense of the other Apostles; yet he spoke for himself; he declared his own faith in Christ; and for that was rewarded accordingly.

Besides, as we hinted above, it was proper that as Christ had chosen twelve apostles, for the spiritual progenitors of the Christians; in imitation of the twelve patriarchs, the carnal progenitors of the Jews; it was befitting that he should also select one as Abraham; who, like that patriarch, for his more perfect faith, should deserve to be made the common head and Father of all the faithful; and therefore do we find the case of Peter, in all respects corresponding with that of Abraham. Abraham excelled by his faith, in God's promise; so did Peter, by his faith in the words of his divine master. Abraham's name was changed, to signify that he should be the Father of many nations; so was Peter's name, to shew, under a metaphorical